

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for granting the telephone interview conducted on July 17, 2009. During the interview, a proposed amendment was presented by the applicant's representative. A further explanation regarding the distinctions between the claimed subject matter and the prior art references, namely Frederick, Auld, and Roskowski, was presented as well. In particular, all cited references fail to disclose all the limitations as required in proposed independent claim 13. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the application in light of the argument and the proposed amendment presented during the interview.

By the present amendment, claims 13-30, 32-37, 41, 43, 45, and 48-55 remain in this application. Claims 1-12, 39, 46, and 47 are canceled in the present application while claims 31, 38, 40, 42, and 44 have been canceled previously. Applicant amends claims 13, 29, and 34 in the present application to more clearly and particularly describe the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 1-10, 12-25, 27-30, 32-37, and 46-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frederick *et al.* (US 6,314,479), hereinafter "Frederick", in view of Auld *et al.* (US 7,316,013), hereinafter "Auld", and Roskowski *et al.* (US 5,257,348), hereinafter "Roskowski". The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons, although independent claims 13, 29, and 34 have been amended to distinguish further the claimed subject matter from the references.

Amended claim 13, in part, explicitly requires "video capture circuitry configured ... convert an interlaced television compatible signal into a noninterlaced television output signal to

be displayed in an overlay window, wherein said interlaced television compatible signal is transmitted from said display apparatus to said video capture circuitry"; and "a communication channel between said host computer system and said display apparatus ... wherein said commands and information include said interlaced television compatible signal received by said video capture circuitry". It is acknowledged in the Office action that Frederick does not expressly disclose a video capture circuitry as required in claim 13. Roskowski and Auld, however, do not overcome the deficiency of the Frederick reference. Roskowski merely discloses an A/D converter (15) and a circuit (19) that translate interlaced video data into non-interlaced data for presentation on output display monitor for displaying either interlaced data or non-interlaced data, but does not teach or suggest that the interlaced television compatible signal is transmitted from said display apparatus to said video capture circuitry through the communication channel. Auld merely discloses multiple picture in pictures on a television monitor (1600) displaying a number of display regions corresponding to various sources, including video, graphics, and television. However, the interlaced television signal of the Auld reference is transmitted from the antennas (123) to the processor of the host computer (110), and then transmitted to the display (132) after processing (see Fig. 1), which is distinguished from the limitation of claim 19 that "the interlaced television compatible signal is transmitted from said display apparatus to said video capture circuitry of the host computer". Furthermore, all the cited references, including Frederic, Roskowski, and Auld, focus on the interlaced signal receiving and processing at the host computer system, instead of the display apparatus. Thus, there is not any motivation in any one of the references to receive the interlaced signal from the display apparatus and transmit it to the video capture circuitry of the host computer system, since

all the references teach or suggest directly receiving the interlaced signal from the host computer system.

Amended claim 13 further requires “a microprocessor for receiving and processing commands from said host computer system, said microprocessor comprising control logic for switching said display apparatus between said interlaced and noninterlaced modes of operation in response to said commands”. It is acknowledged in the Office action that Frederick does not expressly disclose the above-mentioned limitation. Auld, however, also fails to overcome the deficiency. Auld discloses a FFCU for converting various source display formats to destination display formats and converting any input resolutions and scanning modes and any output resolutions and scanning modes, but fails to disclose that the switching is in response to the commands as required in claim 13.

As the prior art references fail to teach all limitations in claim 13, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn.

Regarding amended independent claims 29 and 34, similar to the explanation above with respect to the patentability of claim 13, all prior art references fail to teach all limitations in claims 29 and 34, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 29 and 34 be withdrawn.

Claim 14-25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 35-37, and 48-55 depend from any one of independent claim 13, 29, or 34 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claims 13, 29, and 34.

Claims 1-12, 46, and 47 have been canceled in the present application.

Claims 11 and 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frederick in view of Auld, Roskowski, and Newman *et al.* (US 6,154,600). Claim 26 depends from

independent claim 13 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claim 13. Claim 11 has been canceled.

Claims 39, 41, 43, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frederick in view of Auld, Roskowski, and Gough *et al.* (US 6,072,489). Claim 41, 43, and 45 depend from any one of independent claim 13, 29, or 34 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claims 13, 29, and 34. Claim 39 has been canceled.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. ACER-45264.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /Aaron A. Fishman/  
Aaron A. Fishman – Reg. No. 44,682

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: August 13, 2009